

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 6-8, 15, 16, 23-25, 40-42 and 53-55 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-60 remain pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-9, 12-16, 18-21, 24-26, 29-33, 35-38, 41-43, 45-46, 48-51, 54-56 and 58-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,125 to Paroz et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,857,102 to Bickmore et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,710,790 to Fagioli; claims 5, 17, 22, 34, 39, 47, 52 and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paroz et al., Bickmore et al., Fagioli, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,610,105 to Martin, Jr; claims 6, 23, 40 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paroz et al., Bickmore et al., Fagioli, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,003,067 to Suzuki et al.; and claims 10-11, 27-28, 44 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paroz et al., Bickmore et al., Fagioli, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,363 to Rosenblatt et al. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

The Office Action correctly recognizes that Paroz does not expressly teach that the screen information transmission means transmits only the data of the active window and the objects displayed therein. However, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that Bickmore teaches these features.

As discussed in the previously-filed reply, Bickmore is directed to a method and system for providing device-independent access to the World Wide Web, whereby web page filtering lets a user see only those portions of a web page that the user is interested in. See column 3, lines 20-22 of Bickmore. However, unlike the presently claimed invention, the filtering in Bickmore is performed by either an intermediate server or by the client device, whereby neither of these corresponds to the device to be operated. See, for example, column 9, lines 55-60 of Bickmore, whereby the client refers to the device that is not capable of displaying the image, and as such the image is reduced in size to be thereby displayed by the client (e.g., a cellular phone).

In the Response to Arguments section on pages 17 and 18 of the Office Action, the Office Action asserts that “Bickmore, however, teaches that the document re-authoring system can be implemented on a programmed general purpose computer as well as on a special purpose computer, a programmed microprocessor or microcontroller and peripheral integrated circuit elements, an ASIC or other integrated circuit, a digital signal processor, a hardwired electronic or logic circuit such as a discrete element circuit, a programmable logic device such as PLD, PLA, FPGA, or PAL, or the like.” The Office Action goes on assert that “it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the re-authoring system on the device to be operated in order to reduce the processing load on the client device and eliminate the need for an additional device leading to additional overhead that may be needed.”

Applicants strongly disagree with these assertions made in the Office Action. The fact that column 27, lines 26-48 of Bickmore describes various different types of computer devices to implement document re-authorizing does not change the fact that those different types of computer devices are to be provided as his intermediate server or his client device, and not as his device-to-be-operated. The statements made in the Office Action concerning what one skilled in the art would do are clearly based on hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention, whereby the Examiner is improperly using the teachings of the present invention against the presently pending claims.

Since, at best, column 27, lines 26-48 of Bickmore merely describes different types of computer implementations of his document re-authoring system as provided at an intermediate server or a client device, and since the other cited art of record does not rectify these shortcomings of Bickmore, the presently pending claims 1, 18, 35 and 48 are patentable over the cited art of record.

The presently pending dependent claims under rejection are patentable due to the specific features recited in those claims, as well as for they dependence on one of the independent claims discussed above.

For example, claims 6, 23, 40 and 53 each recites that the screen change detection means, provided on said device to be operated, determines that the change that occurred in the display of the screen is completed when no screen change is detected in the display of the screen for more than a predetermined time period. The Office Action asserts that Suzuki et al. teaches the features recited in claims 6, 23, 40 and 53. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Namely, column 10, lines 1-53 of Suzuki et al. describes a system in which a server receives information and performs screen change detection analysis of screen data provided by different clients. Thus, in Suzuki et al., a screen change detection process is performed at a server, and not at a device to be operated.

Still further, a means for detecting an operation object in an active window is not performed in Suzuki et al.

Accordingly, claims 6, 23, 40 and 53 are patentable for these additional reasons.

With respect to dependent claims 8, 25, 42 and 55, the Office Action relies on Paroz for allegedly teaching the features recited in these claims. In particular, in the Response to Arguments section on page 18 of the Office Action, the Office Action asserts that the recitation of “at least one of” in those claims causes those claims to be disclosed in the cited art of record. By way of this amendment and reply, those claims now recite “each of”, whereby those claims are believed to patentably distinguish over the cited art of record.

Accordingly, claims 8, 24, 40 and 43 are patentable for these additional reasons.

With respect to dependent claims 7, 24, 41 and 54, those claims have been amended to recite screen analysis means for detecting GUI widgets displayed on an active window provided on the screen of said device to be operated to obtain attribute data of said GUI widgets. This is done in response to the comments provided on page 18 of the Office Action, whereby it argued that “Nothing in claims 7, 8 or 9 recites providing x, y, z coordinate position of an active window.” Since those claims now explicitly recite such features, and whereby such features are not taught or suggested by either Paroz, Bickmore or Fagioli, claims 7, 24, 41 and 54 are patentable over the cited art of record.

With respect to dependent claims 15 and 16, the Office Action relies on Paroz for allegedly teachings the features recited in these claims. Claims 15 and 16 have been amended to address the comments provided on page 18 of the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, in order that claims 15 and 16 now clearly distinguish over the teachings of Paroz (which sends an equivalent user interface of a first computer device to a second computing device), which does not take into account differences between picture data and non-picture data provided on a display.

Accordingly, claims 15 and 16 are patentable over the cited art of record.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of

papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 27, 2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5407

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Phillip J. Articola

David A. Blumenthal

Registration No. 26,257

Phillip J. Articola

Registration No. 38,819